DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 315 SP 011 178

AUTHOR Abbey, Brian; Ashenden, Dean
TITLE What Is to be Done in Teacher Education? ['Every Communist Working in the Mass Movements Should be a Friend of the Masses and Not a Boss Over Them, an Indefatigable Teacher and Not a Bureaucratic Politician' (Mao, 1938)].
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Capitalism; Communism; Curriculum Design; Educational Philosophy; Goal Orientation; *Political Issues; Progressive Education; *Social Change; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Australia (South Australia); *Marxism; *School Society Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper is a critique of the Australian educational system from the Marxist viewpoint. The teaching philosophy of the schools of education is based upon capitalistic ideals, despite the emergence of more progressive educational practices. The connection between teaching, politics, and political activism is emphasized in this paper as a positive thing that should be recognized by teacher educators and instilled in fledgling teachers. The point is made that teachers are crucial to social change and that through correct attitudes society can be remodeled. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

APR 7 1977

ED141315

"'Every communist working in the mass movements should be a friend of the masses and not a boss over them, an indefatigable teacher and not a bureaucratic politician' (Mao, 1938): What is to be done in teacher education?"

Brian Abbey

Dean Ashenden

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Note:

This is the text of a paper which was to have been delivered at the Raywood Conference held March 1 - March 3 1974.

SP011178

A. The Social Character, and Personal Significance of Educational Choices

1. When one writes a paper called "Teaching for X" or "Teaching for Y" or says that one is running a teachers college to achieve X or maintain Y, X or Y is a posited objective, something we ought to aim at. It is a desirable value, presumably the most desirable imaginable, or at least the most desirable properly attainable through the activity in question (teaching). That is, the writer or actor is having himself about as a practical moralist, one who acts, cares about the consequences of the act, and believes it possible to influence outcomes by anticipation. When the activity in question is also by way of being one's life-work (vocation) then presumably one is deliberately making a pretty important statement of one's deepest values, preferences and hopes; one is creating for oneself an identity or character, insofar as that can ever be created by thought/speech. This position is common amongst people in education and teacher education; indeed many educationists would see their work as part of an extensive practical morality, a model for social action par excellence.

Less common is the realization that such an approach has (at least) two logically derived imperatives. Firstly, since it wants to have some things (rather than others) flowing from action, it must have a very sound appreciation of what does, in fact, flow from action, lest it lend itself to unexpected, and possibly nasty outcomes. And secondly, since it wants to impose itself on social events (and not, for example, merely be "right" after the event) it must have a good working knowledge of the social terrain, i.e. of the thing it wants to change. In our concrete case, it necessarily follows that educators who express intentions must have a very sound appreciation of how the social order works, and what teaching does to it. To fail to achieve that appreciation is an inconsistency which seriously diminishes both the moral force and the effectiveness of the intentions; it is to be illogical, stupid and careless. Since the formulation and pursuit of the intention are undertaken as a personal decision and responsibility, the failure to achieve a thorough social comprehension of one's actions is a personal, and culpable failure.

There are, however, all kinds of devices - institutional, intellectual, and cultural - which seriously impede individual attempts to link educational goals, aspirations, programs, intentions, ideals, values, etc. with solid social understanding. The educationist who reads with the object of achieving such an understanding will find that many people writing or talking about education manage to avoid making a solid link - they leave out the social dimension altogether, or attentuate and trivialize it, or use mystificatory and confusing concepts to describe it, or talk about it at special times and places, or in special tones of voice,

or see it as being someone else's job. This disposition also finds expression in intellectual styles - "academic" knowledge is split from "professional", and each of these is rendered more impotent by further splits - methodology is separated from the history, sociology and psychology of education; and philosophy is pushed into yet another section. The conventional intellectual wisdom compounds the division, for it would have us believe that each of these fragments can be further atomized by separating the "theoretical" from the "empirical", and each from the "normative". And intellectual styles and sub-cultures have institutional buttressing - administration, teaching and learning are separated from each other and professionalized; teachers and learners are herded into "schools", corralled in "departments" and finally branded with "subjects". All this is not an accident, or the drift of unchecked events. The intellectual division of labour corresponded to the division of labour elsewhere in the productive system; it progressed and is progressing indefinitely.....an implicit renunciation of the claim that the whole of culture and society could be rationally apprehended."[1].

The failure to notice and consider the social consequences of educational practice that is to say to notice the politics of education, has been rendered endemic and characteristic. We have, in fact, a highly political activity which is largely oblivious to its own politics, or even advances the idea that it is apolitical.

We can suggest the strength of this phenomenon, by reminding you that many members of the Sturt Academic Committee believe that questions about the politics of art courses are irrelevant; there are even more who assert that any association of political understandings/intentions/considerations is dangerous/subversive/unprofessional.

If we are to see the politics of teacher education, we will have to drag them into view; ways of seeing the social order and acting in it lie embedded and largely concealed in statements and theories and actions which are characteristic in teacher education. In order to overcome some of these difficulties we want to introduce you to three characters one often meets in the world of teacher education.

B. Three Stereotype Teacher Educators

The first we shall call the "technician". He or she is an "expert" with a clearly defined province which is understood to fit in a mutually-supportive structure of specialisms. Philosophical questions about education's general objectives, about the nature of knowledge, about the function of the school in society are not entirely unfamiliar to the technician - there was a compulsory unit or two dealing with that sort of thing somewhere back in his/her training - but they have long since been excluded from our technician's concerns. Such questions and the answers they usually elicit may have been seen dimly but accurately for what they usually are - speech-night turns; but if our technician is abreast of more recent development it will look more like the province of the recently-appointed expert in 'values'. And moving into the area of another's expertise (whether that be designing curriculum, landscaping the campus, or administering the college) is something our expert is not interested in doing.

Producing a good teacher is all a matter of making sure the student efficiently imbibes the necessary quantities of expertise in the right sequence from the appropriately broad range of properly-certificated experts. The good teacher, it seems, is the right aggregate of skills. But already with these observations we're venturing further into abstract realms than the technician is accustomed to go. He/she has a definite job to do, and certain ways of checking that it is done. Beyond that his/her responsibility does not extend.

The expert knows the empirical work that matters in his field and he/she is aware of some of the as-yet unresolved conceptual difficulties within the paradigm he employs. The technician has great hopes that well-funded expert research committees will promote the detailed behavioural research which in turn will pave the way for improved programmes. Improved programmes will in their turn produce the quantities and types of graduates best suited to society's needs.

If and when the technician turns his gaze from education to the wider society, what he sees is similar though even less theoretical and sophisticated. He appears to have no social theory to speak of, but questioning may reveal that his comfortable faith in the division of labour still holds at the wider level. Society seems to be an aggregate of roles, each with its definite responsibility attached. Existing social institutions are generally accepted as more-or-less natural growths, as more/less efficient ways of allocating and coordinating roles: after all, if they didn't perform efficiently they wouldn't have lasted so long, would they? That some people seem to do better out of these arrangements than others is merely a reflection of the disparate contributions people are able to make and the correspondingly disparate rewards and privileges they attract. Where problems arise it will usually be due to residues of superstition or the application of out-moded or inadequate skills. In such cases it is better to move quickly and devise and administer improved procedures. Otherwise accumulating

frustrations may induce some stirrers to start making something political out of it all. Management, in the technician's eyes, has superseded politics; social complexity makes conflict too costly and wasteful; and we're all too well educated these days to be fooled by ideologies.

The second person we want you to meet, the "progressive liberal humanist", has been around in the edbizz a lot longer, since right back when Headmasters were men, counsellors were alderman, and Acting Assistant Deputy Principals (Planning) weren't heard of.

The PLH's belief in child-centered education reflects his greater sensitivity to those areas of human life that can never be captured by time-tables, grand plans, standardised courses, inflexible rules and impersonal arrangements. The PLH's fondest hopes are to uncover and foster the essence of individuality in each student, to soften the sinews of command without losing control, to show by personal example the possibility of maintaining one's sensibilities and moral independence in the face of largely uncaring and conformist world, to sustain childhood's sense of play and show its value for learning and so on. In all of these ways the PLH sets himself to creat an enclave free from the corruptions of a cynical commercial world in which the child may perhaps form an attachment to finer things and greater sentiments than would be possible outside the walls - an attachment which will perhaps stay with the student throughout later life. The hope is that the attachment to reason and fair play, the awakened sense of poetry of things, the exaltation of the ideal of service and the rejection of the profit motive will equip the student with a durable set of ideals against which the barbaric blandishments of a world obsessed with money, material goods and base pleasures will never prevail.

Perhaps the key to PLH's strategy for building the new man is his belief in relaxation. Relaxing the institutional restraints somewhat will foster 'self-discipline' in the pupil. Relaxing the expectations we have of the child will reduce his anxiety and reveal his capacity for spontaneity. Relaxing intellectual standards will disguise the failure of some students to meet them - at least, it will until they leave school. Relaxing social inhibitions will permit emotional expression, facilitate 'communication', and thus reduce those internal blocks and 'hang-ups' which presently are the main obstacles to the realization of 'our common humanity'. Another of the PLH's distinguishing marks is his relativism. His ethical relativism, butressed by innumerable odd yarns from anthropologists' notebooks, has recently been deepened and sophisticated by new work in epistemology. The whole of what we have been calling reality is, it now appears, merely a creation of the group mind. The world is in fact merely our idea of the world. This is a great encouragement to anyone like the PLH who is bent on changing the world by changing our ideas. But the new epistemology, the PLH must insist, contains a warning too. It warns that 'Reality' is an intellectual construct designed to name and tame the natural chaos of the universe and thereby bring order into lives which would otherwise be formless, and probably nasty, brutish and short too. This valuable common heritage is by no means sacrosanct, says our PLH, but one must be aware that nothing can come through rents in the basic fabric of civilisation but the darker lunacies of disorder. This

fragility must be remembered whenever we launch any attempt to oust the scoundrels who, through their insensitivity and greed, so cruelly pervert and deflect society's finest possibilities. It must be remembered too when we address the masses to rouse them from their inexplicable philistinism and prejudice.

It should be clear from all this that our society holds many disappointments for the PLH. The effect of these over the years is usually to deepen his feelings for the tragedy of what he calls the 'human condition'; to make him a little less evangelical (but not less firm!) about what he concedes to be 'an unshakeable faith in human nature'. In recent years he has frequently been seen offering this wisdom to determined militants, towards whom he now feels more paternal than fraternal. His fear of what he calls their 'fanaticism' makes his reconciliation with the 'smooth, bland democratic unfreedom' of late capitalism just a little easier. And this reconciliation is now being hastened by the present changes in the Australian education system, as we shall see later in this paper.

The third character in our rogues' gallery is the most important of all. The 'New Manager' combines within himself something of the Technician's regard for order and skill with something of the PLH's colour and breadth of vision; and his task in essence is to blend and coordinate these disparate forces within his institution. We are going to learn to call this man an expert in "human resources" management, which is so much nicer, don't you think, than calling him 'boss'. But boss he will be, for the evolving institutional structures and command styles now being thrown up by late capitalism mean that the world is the New Manager's oyster.

What the New Manager doesn't know about accountancy and general business management when he is appointed he will soon learn. Such knowledge will be of greater daily use to him than his fading memories of his teaching experience. It is unlikely that he will be aware of the humour inherent in the term 'educational administration' - witness the way other mutually incompatible terms are yoked together (e.g. 'military intelligence') and accepted without question into the language. Nor will he see anything strange about maintaining that his function is to serve the teachers and learners - the learners he so rarely sees, the teachers he appoints at a half or third his salary and lodges in offices no bigger than his comfortably equipped 'conversation nook'. Indeed he might go so far as to maintain, jocularly and privately, that the main difference between him and his underlings is that he works harder (and he probably does - all parties lose by that.)

In so many ways he resembles his modern counterparts in the worlds of general public administration and private enterprise. Like him he is a believer in team-work (he 'heads up a management team'), he is a 'persuader' by choice rather than an 'enforcer', he believes in limited devolution of powers through the committee system (he may these days even speak of 'worker participation'). Like them he is keenly aware

of the need to 'innovate' and will probably seek to plan that into the flow chart too, so that it may be better controlled. 'Orderly change' through 'proper channels' doesn't scare him; indeed the management of continuous adjustment is perhaps the essence of his role and his prime personal strength. There is of course a complicated and extensive filtering system through which any proposals for change must pass, and since our Manager is a reasonable man, it is naturally a rare thing for the vote to go against his wishes.

He will probably retain, as part of his leadership role, the position of the institution's chief idelogue, but his message will lack the open, confident dogmatism and clear-cut substanive moral pronouncements of his more fundamentalist predecessors. He will rather preach progress, flexibility, cooperation, integration. Compared with his predecessors, our New Manager will spend rather more of his time in committee with Ministers and high State or Federal apparatchiki - with whom, by the way, he will feel more at home than he does with students. In dress, speech habits and consumption patterns he will increasingly resemble the captains of industry rather than the personally austere educators of past but recent days.

The New Manager is more able than either of his colleagues to give a connected account of the political structure of society and of education's place in that structure. That is not to say that his account is likely to be especially penetrating or sophisticated; or that there are any great differences between the account he articulates and ones his colleagues in education act upon.

The New Manager is a believer in 'representative democracy' - that system where 'the people' (artificially constituted as 'the electorate') emerge from the depths of their learned political ignorance and apathy every three years to 'choose' their masters for the next three. He thinks parliamentary decisions represent the will of the people, and in obeying these decisions, or the versions of them prepared by the bureaucracy, he is content that his institution is 'subject to democratic control'. He is familiar with words like 'accountability', though not always clear about the implications; he speaks a good deal about 'the taxpayer's money' but proceeds in the comfortable knowledge that the taxpayer is well out of sight.

He has his own political preferences, of course, but knows these mustn't become too prominent. That involves little or no sacrifice for him since his political feelings aren't strong or often under scrutiny.

The Manager, like his colleagues, stands unwittingly in the tradition of the consensus school of social theory which has been so perceptively described by Horton. 2. Holding that harmony is natural and conflict aberrant, they regard politics as pathological, as indicative of some breakdown of the natural order of things; as indicative of equilibrium and paradise lost.

These men hold and act out these and other socio-political views, but they are as a rule unable or unwilling to articulate and defend them. They will maintain,

perhaps, that it is impossible to characterise society at a general level. They certainly have little or no awareness of their own society's distinctive character and the extent to which its assumptions and habits permeate their being and practice. Such an awareness would require that they have at least a lively imaginative grasp of some other possibilities, and this they rarely have in any measure. The paradigm within which they live and operate is not understood as one of several possibilities: rather it is known only from the inside, seen as coterminous with reality. The weltanschauung within which they adopt their different stances is simultaneously the prop and product of everyday life in capitalist society. None of our three educators is really at home with challenges from outside his or her paradigm, and each finds varying degrees of difficulty in making sense of views that call into question not only conclusions and data, but unconscious interpretative maxims as well. People who do that are quaint, half-serious, misguided, fanatical, or just plain malicious. Not one of our three is that rare unparochial fish who knows that the water he swims in is wet.

Our purpose in this section has been to offer rough characterisations of three common figures, mentioning something of their methods, assumptions and aspirations. Shortly we shall sketch the social arena in which these educators work, so that we can gauge their actual effects on distinct from their intended ones. But first, a word about an absent friend. Our rogues' gallery includes no conservative, or more precisely, no reactionary figure. This is no accident. There are few principled, aware conservatives in education today, and they are usually ignored. We too shall ignore them - not simply because their views and vocabularies are unfashionable, but because the tide of events has passed them by. We have to contend not with conservatives but with technicians, PLH's and modern managers. We will now turn to say why we "contend".

In baldest terms we can point to one fundamental disagreement with all of them - each represents a social theory which fails to isolate the essence of our social order. That failure is displayed by their talk about "post industrial" society or "technological" society, "consumer" society or "modern" society, society which is "advanced", or "space-age" or "permissive" or "twentieth century" or "mass" or "pluralist" - indeed anything but what it is. It is capitalist.

C. A Plain Man's Guide to How the (Capitalist) World Works

To insist that our society is "capitalist" is a crude but essential way of insisting that any society is grounded in the way it produces its material life, and that in this society control of the major instruments of production, distribution and exchange are in private hands and are controlled by them for the purposes of creating profit and ensuring the stability of the profit system. Profit can only be produced by taking more from someone than you give him - by the appropriation of

surplus value. It is another way of saying that under capitalism some men must exploit others. To do it the exploiters will have to band together and combine against the exploited; they will have to use force, or threat of force, or trickery to maintain their control of the instruments of production. Having that control the exploiters will then hold the trump card in their dealings with those who must sell their labour - the "workers". The worker must come to the party on the "owners" terms. The capitalist's search for profit is a restless one; to stand still is to fall behind; he is, of necessity, a competitor; his fellow capitalists will be seen as fellows only when all are threatened. For the rest of the time the struggle between capitalists is intense. The capitalist will constantly try to organise those without capital so that they produce more, and produce it more efficiently. In the process those people will be reduced to poverty; be it relative or absolute, physical or psychological. They will be immiserated.

This kind of talk has become unfashionable. Various people, from the most sophisticated social theorist to the talk-back compere (and, as we have noted, teacher educators) have facts or arguments to prove it wrong. These days they say "the people" control production because their representatives pass laws which regulate what is produced, what standards it must meet, what resources it may or may not consume, and so forth; or they say that our representatives pass laws protecting the worker from abuse, or unfair wages; and laws to make sure that things are shared up more equally, that the unfortunate (the aged, the unemployed, the sick) are cared for; and still other laws to provide equal access for all our sons and daughters to schooling, and through it, to the good things in life. This first batch of arguments essentially concludes that the state is the people's instrument, is independent of capital and able to control it.

A second defence is to say that even without these laws capitalists no longer have the upper hand. They were foiled sixty or seventy years ago by the rise of the unions, and lately they've been de-throned by the 'managerial revolution'. There is no such thing as a capitalist in industry any more, the argument runs, there are only managers, and they behave like rational human beings, not exploiters. Lately this case has been given a new twist with the arrival of the 'technological society' - we now have planners, experts and systems-men who are even less concerned with private profit than the 'manager', not the least reason being that most of them, it's claimed, work for the government or non-profit agencies, and their numbers are growing fast. This group of arguments maintains that the dominance of capitalism has been ended by the growth of 'counter-vailing' social groups (e.g. unions) or independent ones (the civil service, expert managers, planning agencies and the like).

Another line of defence is to maintain that our society is now so large and complex that major spheres of activity go on more or less independent of each other, and to talk of capitalism as shaping such disparate things as education, government and the arts, for example, is plainly

ridiculous. What's more, the argument runs, since activities of the cultural, educational, recreational and entertainment kind are occupying more and more of the lives of more and more of the people, there is not much point worrying about capitalism which is a shrinking island. These are the 'pluralist', 'permissive' or 'post-industrial' society believers.

We could extend the list - we have left out those timeless types, the stoic, the human-nature-pessimist and their peculiarly Australian colleague, the knocker. And we have left out the mindless optimist, the believer in happiness-is-where-you-find-it, and various religious and mystical escapists and irrationalists. But we do have serious contenders - those who argue some combination of these theories about our social order - that it's controlled and made civilized by the democratic state; that its production is contained or managed by countervailing or independent groups; and lastly, that one great amorphous smorgasbjord of opportunities, diversions and delights. All of these theories are false. We live in a society whose character is determined by capitalism in very developed form, what is usually termed neo-capitalism. It has five distinctive elements.

(i) Capitalization

Of the three basic factors of production - land, labour and capital, land and labour are shrinking relatively, (in some places land is shrinking absolutely). The absolute and relative size of capital is growing rapidly. One expression of this is that technological devices of one kind or another are doing more and more of the production of goods and the administration it requires. This development lies behind the increasing importance and complexity and range of skills needed to control production, and processes which are ancillary to production; thus too the ever-increasing specialization of skilled work. These developments are the necessary outcome of competition between capitalists, and of the overall century-long decline in return on capital; so too is the process of consolidation.

(ii) Consolidation

More and more of the 'economy' is being owned and/or controlled by fewer companies of increasing size. This is true on both the national scale and the international. It is true of every capitalist society, without exception. Even states are being consolidated - witness the Common Market.

(iii) Integration

As organizations grow larger, and their tasks more complex (and therefore more separate and separating), so it becomes an increasingly vexatious problem to maintain harmony and balance - this is just as true of balance in the production of things (witness the present shortages of everything) as it is of the co-ordination of activity - i.e. people. The solution lies in policies of integration. The first great integration was of the state and capitalism; it began in most countries around the turn of the century, and has been an uneven business - in Bismarck's Germany or Japan it almost preceded need; in the US it has consistently lagged behind. In Whitlam's Australia it is going along just nicely thank you. The state long ago began to provide essential ancilliary services for private venture (tarriffs, roads, navies, etc); in neo-capitalism the state's functions are integrally linked with those of capitalism - it trains manpower, collects information on its functioning, coordinates various sectors, encourages or discourages various productions, and so on. "The classical market has disappeared and has been replaced not simply by structures of a monopolistic or oligopolistic sort but by a complicated apparatus of controlled, interlocking processes... The bourgeois state has become so embedded in the economy proper, to the point of assuming coordinating and even command functions in some societies that we are entitled to speak of a 'neo-capitalist' social type which has largely replaced the older type of capitalism, in which the state and economy were quite distinct."3.

More recently the state has intervened to shape not only production, but the culture which grows out of it and supports it; and just as it has shaped "the economy" for capitalism's greater glory, so does the State shape culture in ways which are either directly amenable to capitalist needs, or which do them no harm. The beginning of this process was free, compulsory and secular schooling - the creation of a docile, orderly and regular workforce i.e. people. Since then the state has provided institutional services which promote or restore "normality" (social welfare, mental health services, advisory services to migrants, youth, etc). Most recently it has become the major patron, and thus determining force, of everything from sport to grand opera. In these ways neo-capitalism, through its state, is rapidly coming to dominate the construction of a whole way of being and seeing the world, of a culture.

Characteristically enough this integration is itself being carried on by institutions which are increasing in size, and are ever-more fully consolidated. Its necessary result is a way of being which lacks diversity, activity and generativity. The members of the most "advanced" societies in history spend far less of their time in freely undertaken non-economic, expressive and productive activity than almost any "primitive" society you care to name.

(iv) The concealment of control

Early capitalism depended heavily on force or the threat of force, as Wilberforce and Shaftsbury testify. Since those times control has depended less on physical violence. Capitalist social control has advanced with rises in the proportion of the population engaged in capitalist production; with the diffusion of appropriate ideas and cultural forms and institutions, and most recently, with the construction of ever-larger formations of administration and management. These formations rise in ever-more elaborate and intricate form between the outsider and the boys at the top. For all these reasons it has simply become much much harder to see who is running what. The social system has become increasingly opaque. "The dominant groups", say Schaar and Wolin, "prefer the politics of influence and indirect power, rarely flaunt their privileges, and are open to new recruits. It has been a century since they have told the public where it can go." 4.

(v) The 'new' bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is the creation and creature of capitalism. It was capitalism's answer to the exercise of power by whim, or family, or ignorance, and was thus a weapon in its struggle against traditional social forces - mainly landed and aristocratic political power; and it solved the problems of coordination and control produced by the unprecendented vigour and diversity of capitalist production. It came subsequently to have important idelogical functions - it obscured control, and made power appear to be neutral, as we have seen. In its pure Weberian form the bureaucracy was a marvel of rigour, uniformity, dedication, reliability and accuracy. But most of these booquets sound like brickbats to the modern management theorist. "An innovative organization", he says, "requires a different structure of the relationship between people. It requires a team organization rather than a command organization, and it requires flexibility in relationships."5. Has the apostle of or post industrial been vindicated? Certainly not, for out theorist, in this case the management guru Peter Drucker, continues "...there has to be discipline, there has to be authority, and there has to be someone who can make decisions." 6. What we are now seeing about us is the modification of bureaucratic forms to counter the worst effects of rigidity - effects which have become increasingly counter-productive, partly because the scale of institutions has escalated and partly because the changing character of work has made the imposition of control by manifest external authority unacceptable. Old bureaucracy has begun to produce inefficiency and discontent. Drucker rightly perceives that the way to have your cake and eat it too is to have each worker, (not just the supervisor or the foreman or the manager) internalize the perspective of the boss; motivation

.../12.

for the modern worker, Drucker tells us "must come from within the worker himself." 7. Thus does capitalism intervene in private being; its minions in this case are the industrial psychologist, the factory social worker, the personnel man, the management consultant; their instruments have been the open space office plan, the staff training seminar, the company social club. Increasingly they will do their work through the provision of strictly circumscribed or illusory "freedom" and "responsibility", and through the construction of various schemes for 'participation' - i.e. for keeping control where it is, and implicating the controlled in the work of their masters. That is why you read a good deal about such things in the "Advertiser" of late.

But once again Drucker provides unmistakable evidence of the real character of all these schemes (all of which he ardently espouses): "To satisfy the workers" he insists "is not and can never be the first task of the pluralist (nb) organizations of our society. They must satisfy people outside, must serve a purpose outside, must achieve a result outside."8. In brief, new means to old capitalist ends.

We now turn from a survey of neo-capitalism to an account of education in neo-capitalism. In that account we will attempt to tie our abstract model to particular developments in education, and in the process demonstrate the subservient, but crucial position of education in that society.

D. Education and Capitalism

It is our working hypothesis that we are taking part in a fundamental re-organization of the entire education system, one which is retrospect will appear analogous to the great upheavals of a century ago, when the first national education systems were being established to meet the new needs of capitalist industrial production. Perhaps the most illuminating analogy is that of the U.K.; the first to achieve capitalist industrial production, the UK fell behind its later rivals in technological innovation (especially the US) and deliberate social adaption (especially Germany). The German education system had long been the source of trained administrative labour for English capital and the envy of its modernists; at last the British state intervened and created a state education system in a flurry of activity around the 1870's. It is our hypothesis that much the same thing is happening in Australia now, and it probably has its origins in the combination of two circumstances: establishment of a state-sponsored and comprehensive schooling system which, being an imitation of the English, was premature; and secondly, the sudden growth, indeed almost establishment, of a domestic industrial capitalism since the second world war. As change in the productive system, and with it some sections of the social system, raced

ahead, the education system remained isolated and increasingly backward. The need for an education system in close tune with new productive and social circumstances became overdue. The pace and intensity of the change thus required increased as each year passed without action. When at last the process of adaptation got underway, it did so with almost tumultous energy. The historian's old cliche, the floodgate, is in order.

To some it would seem that the new Labor Government has released these energies, but the process really began nearly ten years ago, with the Martin Report of 1965. It looked at the sector most clearly inadequate to need, the tertiary sector, and set its modernization in train. Money began to flow into the universities system, and then into the non-university tertiary sector. Now it is beginning to flow into the primary, secondary and even pre-school sectors. The resources available to the formal education system have begun to match, even exceed the demands placed upon it. And as a direct consequence of the new needs and the even newer provision, the centre of gravity of the education system has shifted further and further towards the top. It is here that we look to understand the nature of the social forces which have generated this shift.

The most obvious change in the tertiary sector is its absolute and relative size (number of students, cost, number of staff etc). But it has not merely expanded; it has greatly diversified its services. Again we have not yet done the empricial work, but a quick count of the number and type of courses available to post-school students would, we are confident, reveal a very rapid increase in available options. Each of these developments (in size, and in the diversity of offerings) has its origins in the changing character of capitalist production, and with it changes in the character of work. We are in a period of decline in the proportion of unskilled or semi-skilled tasks, and with it of manual labor. There is a corresponding increase in the proportion of 'knowledge work' - work involving the acquisition and application of intellectual skills of one kind or another. This is, at bottom, not a consequence of the advance of mankind, or the march of knowledge, or the latest in a series of triumphs in man's battle with nature, but the outcome of the increasing capitalisation of production, and beyond that of the great imperatives of competition and of ever-shrinking return on capital.

The implications for education are not far to seek: "formal organized education" says Drucker "has replaced experience - acquired traditionally through apprenticeship - as the foundation of productive capacity and performance." 9. This bald fact does much to suggest the origins of change of education in our society, change which can only be explained in the connections between education and production. But a detailed account of the connection is difficult. In part this is because there are considerable theoretical problems, and in part because the management of the connections is, in actual social practice is an imprecise and ill-conducted business. "Teaching", Drucker grumbles "is where agriculture was in about 1750".10. "We need a theory" he observes (correctly) "that can measure the effectiveness of knowledge (and) the

the efficiency of education".11. The Australian Commission on Advanced Education is more restrained, but is troubled by problems in 'placing' the system's products, of determining the length and character of courses so that they will be appropriate to industries needs, of getting a 'balanced development of tertiary education'.12. Its last report says that "A continuing program of research and investigation directed towards the specific needs and problems of development in a rapidly growing system of advanced education remains a basic need."13.

But our analysis of the connections between capitalist need and educational provision can, despite our theoretical problems and the system's practical difficulties, go further than merely reporting the announced intentions of management consultants and high-level planners. We can see that many of the developments in the management of education, in pedagogy and curriculum, are such as to serve new production needs; indeed they often do so by adopting styles and techniques which are strikingly like those emerging in the sphere of production.

To suggest some of these connections we turn to look firstly at the management of the system. We find that there has apparently been a diffusion of social control of these institutions; a wave of "autonomy" has swept through this sector; the god-professor is in decline, and with him the headmaster-principal. Seried ranks of boards, councils, commissions and committees have appeared. All of these are commonly seen as examples of a new sharing of social power. We believe that they are the reverse. The paradigm of the new management has been the Australian Universities Commission; the AUC reminds us that with public money comes state control. Doug White is not going too far when he suggests that State control has produced one Australian mega-university on the model of, say, the University of California.14. Consolidation is the rule and education is no exception.

The same development has occurred in the non-university tertiary sector. Two things must be noted. The first is the lodging of essential control (i.e. of overall policy, of criteria for making non-policy decisions, and of the appointment of the people who'll make these 'decisions') in the hands of a small central state elite. It is thus an excellent example of a general development which Birnbaum has described as the "oligopolistic and monopolistic domination of public intellectual life."15. The second aspect of the new management is the modification of what Drucker has labelled the "command organization" and its reappearance as the "innovative" or "team" organization much championed by the same author. These new organizational forms secure central control in three ways - ways already noted in our general description of neo-capitalism. The first is the stimulation of acceptable 'flexibility' and 'creativity' which reduce the inefficiency of the old forms. The second and consequent result is the reduction of hostility and resentment generated by 'command' bureaucracy. The third is an increase in the complexity of the system and a consequent increase in its opacity. These things make it harder to question the system's legitimacy; it's an unusual lecturer (or student) these days who knows how the tertiary system works, much less how to have a

fight with it. In these ways we find that the tertiary education system is itself being integrated into capitalism, and is exhibiting the consolidation and integration of internal control which is characteristic of capitalism at large.

These institutional forms demand a new ideology. Now that the modern, creative intellectual worker is relieved of the day-to-day interference of the control beuraucrat, he must demonstrate his "responsibility". In the place of external direction we find internalized control. The "motivation", as Drucker insists, must come from "within". It will be produced by the new ideology of 'professionalism'. It is no accident that this doctrine is ardently espoused by Hugh Hudson. To the ideology is added material blandishment for a newly-important group. We are now paid up to 2½ times as much as we were paid 6 years ago, yet we're still doing the same job. The modern professional intellectual is not only a fatcat, but a tamecat.

We are witnessing, then, the conscious construction and rationalisation of a system of production of intellectual skills which will, in the expectations of its creators, come to service capitalist production with increasing accuracy and fidelity.

Thus, in order to produce capitalism must reproduce and expand the means of production; therefore, as the means of production increasingly assume the form of skilled and intellectualy trained labour so will the means of that reproduction, the education system, be increasingly important to capitalism.

But as Marx reminds us, a system of production also requires the reproduction of the relations of production. It must have the means of producing people with the disposition to comply with, or preferably embrace, the patterns of relations which are to be found in the factory, the office, the shop, the commonly-found workplace. At this point we must briefly diverge to sketch a second working hypothesis about the character of present educational experience.

It is our guess that the reproduction of skills is being handed to one sector and the reproduction of dispositions to another. The new tertiary system (together with rapidly growing ancillary systems operated by capitalist companies, and Departments of Labour etc) handles skills; a schools system, now in the process of refurbishment, will handle dispositions and foundation skills. We will deal very briefly with the school's task before passing on to a consideration of teacher education in all this.

The development of open classrooms, of more relaxed pedagogies, of integrative curricula, of humanist-progressive attitudes, of new relationships between the school and the community, of relaxation of formal assessment, have all been seen as signs that the school system is shaping up as society's better half, as its guide and mentor, its prefiguration, its vanguard. Less hopeful, but still optimistic versions of this scheme (such as the most recent of the Karmel reports) hold out the hope that the school will be a kind of enclave, enshrining deeper and more enduring values than the world

outside, a kind of demiliterized zone. Even if we can't hope to remodel society through the school, this version runs, we might at least soften it by a kind of osmosis. These scenarios, and their variants (together drawing themselves into a new orthodoxy or popular wisdom) are illusions, false consciousness. Again we will rely on Drucker to say, in spite of himself, why. Listen to him, for example, on the new enquiry curriculum, the end of 'subjects': "the most important thing they (school students) will have to learn is not this or that subject matter ... but a universal skill - that of using knowledge and its systematic acquisition as the foundation for performance, skill and achievement." 16. And the authoritarian teacher? No less than the enemy of modern capitalism, for "if only students were permitted to learn, they would acquire the total information concept of modern schooling in a fraction of the time." 17. The community school? By all means, for "in knowledge society" Drucker maintains "school and life can no longer be separated. They have to be linked in an organic process in which one feeds back on the other." 18. To cap it off Drucker pleads for a general education for everybody, for the "trained perception and the disciplined emotion", he suggests, "are as pertinent to the ability to earn a livelihood (sic) as they are to the mature human personality." 19. Thus do capitalism, educational theory and Human Nature sweetly conspire; the lion of industry and the lamb of progressive education lie down together. In the nineteenth century the school reformer wanted to remove the child from the pernicious influences of the home, and thus looked forward to "the regulation of feelings and dispositions, the extirpation of vicious propensities, the preoccupation of the wilderness of the young heart with the seeds and germs of moral beauty, and the formation of a lovely and virtuous character by the habitual practice of cleanliness, delicacy, refinement, good temper, gentleness, kindness, justice, and truth." 20. This apparently progrssive ideology was, as Katz pointed out a step towards a schooling system "required for the conduct of complex urban society", a "training ground for commerce". 21. Does the new progressive rhetoric and practice have the same relationship to the capitalism of its day? Is the progressive who argues for sponteneity, flexibility, student initiative, group activity, creativity, togetherness, student enquiry, etc., accommodating schooling to the development of an appropriate culture just as surely as the nineteenth century priest of delicacy, refinement, good temper etc. etc.? We are increasingly persuaded that the school is being liberated for these tasks because it is being relieved of its formerly stern role in the production of productive skills (reading riting rithmatic); the skills now needed have become more complex, varied and sophisticated, and must, therefore, be handed over to a system which comes later in life, and is more capable of the creation of a vast range of skills in quite delicate balance of proportion and distribution. Yet, as Drucker points out, these skills can only be developed in a clientele which has appropriately trained emotions, and broadly-based aptitudes for specialist training. These latter will increasingly be the tasks of the schools; and as this task grows so will the illusions referred to above as theories of the vanguard and the demilitarized zone.

We are now in the position to attempt a connection between apparently unrelated phenomena - the maturation of neo-capitalist production and a particular segment of tertiary education - the production of teachers.

B. Teacher Education and Capitalism

In 1960 there were six teachers colleges in Australia; they catered to a total of 2,057 students; in 1973 there were 33 teachers colleges and 30,858 students. 22. The graph rises more sharply as time goes goes by: in 1975 there will be 37,978 students. 23.

All this has become an expensive business; commonwealth expenditure on teacher education in C.A.E.'s alone in the present triennium was planned to be $83,943,500. 24. Teacher education expansion is very much a part of the overall expansion of tertiary education, especially the non-university sector.

Expansion, as elsewhere, has come with reorganization and, to a lesser extent, the creation of new elements in the organisation. Broadly speaking the Commission is attempting to catch up for the time lost when Menzies rejected the Martin Committee's recommendations for teacher education; these proposals formed the basis of commonwealth reorganization of teacher education when it was at last begun during Fraser's regime, on 17th August 1972. There was the by-now familiar emphasis on consolidation, (the Commission had modestly declared that it will "encourage" single purpose teachers colleges to "amalgamate with other tertiary institutions"); 25 and it has faced up to the "special problems" which such a "complete break with past arrangements" bring, and is busy establishing "new machinery for planning, estimating and coordinating". 26.

We also find that the principles of mdoern management have been well learned; the fact of central control is dressed in the garments of autonomy. The Commission urges, for example, the establishment of a "permanent liaison committee on teacher education be established", and that it comprise "representatives of the Australian Universities Commission and the Australian Commission on Advanced Education"; having advocated the creation of another instrument of consolidated control in one breath, it goes on without pause or blush to suggest that the very same instrument should give encouragement to "diversity, innovation and experiment." 27. It insists that "The role of co-ordinating bodies will be to 'co-ordinate' rather than to control or direct"; 28 yet at the same time it points out that "The general rule applies in all States that courses in constituent colleges must be approved by the co-ordinating authority, which has the power to refuse finance for any course." 29. And the Commission seeks to have each unit embrace the same principle of economic rationality - it urges that "each college should have a master plan" to "promote better detailed design of individual courses in each triennium". 30.

Part and parcel of these strategies is the establishment of boards, councils and the like; just as these bodies have the functions, referred to earlier, of integrating each institution into the over-arching structure, so do they serve, in the Commission's hopes at last, to integrate staff and students into the management of the constituent institutions. "A feature of the 1970-72 triennium" the Commission is pleased to note "has been the acceptance of the principle of academic staff and

student participation in council affairs"; this, it feels, "is an essential feature in bringing tertiary educational institutions to full maturity of outlook and management". It is clearly management rather than politics the Commission has in mind, for it thinks that "such participation at Council level achieves its best results when the college population accepts the fact that ... the staff and student members so elected are, in fact independent councillors in their own right, making an effective contribution by bringing a staff/student view to bear, without necessarily being advocates for staff/student policy." 31. The assumption of compatibility of groups of markedly differing and sometimes seriously conflicting interests is typical of the concensual-management thrust of the Commission's policies.

But quite aside from its (highly functional) carelssness of the politics of various representational bodies, the Commission completely ignores the fact that such powers as do survive at the institutional level accrue almost effortlessly to internal bureaucracies. They alone possess all the relevant information; theirs is the unique position of being in contact with all parties; they control large support groups (ancilliary staff of varying degrees of usefulness); they dominate the key bodies within the institutions; they are the institution's representatives when it connects with the system beyond; theirs is the monopoly of experience in the operation of the system at several levels. And they're permanent to boot. The Commission ignores all this and rather seems to believe that administration is something skilled people do to let educators get on with the educating; it blandly ignores any impact that one might have on the other, or at least assumes that the educators will in some way prevail over the administrators if it comes to a crunch. The IGPP demonstrated, if demonstration were needed, that this is a radical misconception which can only survive because it is so rarely challenged in practice, so firmly entrenched is managerial suzerainty. 32.

To summarise our argument about the new management of teacher education, we suggest that the kindest possible assumption one can make is that the good men who decide these things are a bit naive if they think that 'co-ordination', 'good management', 'autonomy', 'master plans', 'diversity' and 'representation' add up to anything more than the construction of a consolidated and integrated system which will render its services to capitalism all the more efficiently because it is following capitalism's very own example.

But there's not only a new management - like other products of the new system of intellectual training, teachers are being fitted out with a refurbished and upgraded ideology; "they are professionals", the Commission insists. "A mark of the professional ... (it continues) is an assured competence. Nothing less than high quality craftsmanship is acceptable from the professional. 33. But these new professionals are not mere technicians we spoke of earlier: their professional education must include "a general liberal education" and "theory of education". 34.

And the new professionals have been allocated the task of modernizing the pedagogy and (to a lesser extent) the

curriculum of the new tertiary education. The Commission notes "a general willingness to abandon hidebound or traditional attitudes and to experiment in such vital matters as, for example ... the use of modern educational technologies in teaching programmes, the design of inter-disciplinary curricula to meet new community needs, 35.1 .." (1). It is in the areas of pedagogy, curriculum and social relations of teacher education that we see revealed the particular 'community needs' met by people like us.

Both the lecturer and the student seem, in the new order of things to be more responsible, to be professionals; the dread hand of the E.D. and the old style principal have been lifted from the modern young lecturer's back; a new pedagogy emerges; the student gets "freedom" and "responsibility". He enjoys the demise or decline of the lecture, the rigid program, the textbook, the set essay, the horrendous exam. He is now likely to be offered a range of projects, for which he can read widely (even across 'subject' 'boundaries'). He may be invited to join its assessment. His role will be expanded to participation in more and more discussion groups; discussion may even include 'planning' or 'directing' the course. Even where things do not advance to this point, they do often include the right of the student to choose between and within different course options. When one of the present authors was a teachers college student it was a standard but not particularly funny joke to remark that it was possible to walk into any lecture, listen for a few seconds, and thus determine the time of the day, the day of the week and the month of the year, so reliable was the pedagogic machine. It seems like a story from the dark ages, but it was only eleven years ago. Pedagogy certainly has changed, and changed with great speed.

But it has not been 'revolutionised'; the essence of the relationship between the teacher and the student remains, and it is this: the teacher controls the student's life experience. The teacher may have suspended his right to determine the precise lineaments of the student's learning; but he has substituted a series of disguised controls which find a striking parallel in the management system in which the teacher himself works. For what he allows the student is a circumscribed and illusory freedom - for it will be revoked the moment the student steps beyond the permissable. Let him want to determine assessment, not simply participate; or reject a subject or course altogether - not merely be an accomplice in its "modification"; let him try to introduce a radically different choice into the smorgasbord; or insist on doing less of a course component than somebody else. The moment the student tries to move beyond these boundaries he will find that he has felt free only because he hadn't bothered to find out where the boundaries are. But this rarely happens, for the modern lecturer has all kinds of ministrations, devices and ploys to head off a collision with the boundaries, to stifle the consciousness a collision would bring. He will surround the troublesome student with new choices of his own manufacture; or will bring his fluency and confidence to bear on a troubled and inarticulate discontent, and so demonstrate its foolishness/immaturity/impracticality/irresponsibility. He may even assert that he knows better - but that's to be avoided where possible.

This acculturation will be highly functional when the student leaves College and himself becomes a teacher. He will still be filling out in concrete action variations on themes constructed by others, (but presented to him as the means of his achievement of professional freedom) - these will be the modern curricula, complete with handbooks for the teacher, they will be the programs decided in essence by the senior staff (no doubt with consultation); they will be the programmed materials of the newly stocked resource centre. But the new teacher will occupy a new place in the (partially-obscured and softened) hierarchy. He will no longer be at the bottom; he will be one step up. He will play his part in the manufacture of false freedom, of uniform 'alternatives', of pre-defined responsibility, as he steps into the open classroom. He is the modern classroom manager; threats, coercion, external controls, authoritarian persona - all these are out. In come gentle persuasion, the construction of a circumscribed field of activities, manners, attitudes; the encouragement of internalized learning habits, ways of complying with the order of a pre-defined society, of the construction, in short, of just those skills and dispositions which Drucker correctly sees as the basis of the "team" organization, the knowledge worker, the society of self-motivators.

In all this the pedagogy of the modern teachers colleges will, (like its management) provide the means of remoulding the school to its newly-specialized function; it will provide the new teacher with his 'professionalism', his models of progressive pedagogy. The new teacher education is in a key position in the complex series of transmission belts which convey the needs of neo-capitalist production and administration through boards and councils and managers and ideologies down to the classroom floor.

But just as there must be a new way of relating to authority, so too must there be a new way of seeing the world. There must be a new curriculum. Here again the teachers college occupies a strategic position - though not so exclusive as its role in pedagogy, because it shares the field of curriculum more evenly with subject consultants and inservice training conferences. Again there is no need for me to go into close details about curriculum changes, because as befits a vanguard member of the vanguard sector of modernization, we at Sturt are already well along the road to reorganization and modernization. We are familiar with the rapid decay of the idea that the knowledge we retail is absolute or objective; with it the traditional form of organization of knowledge, the "discipline", has lost its potency and vigour. We are left with the "subject" - a less confident claim - and within the "subject" there is less willingness to define areas, to determine balance between areas, to prescribe exact sequences. At some points even "subjects" have caved in, leaving "themes" or "problems" or "areas". The English department's rigour (or rigidity, depending on your point of view) seems a bit quaint and old-fashioned to most. But the English Department is on solid ground when it accuses most of its detractors of having no clear idea of what new forms of organization will look like. Only the behaviourists are immune to this criticism, for they have no difficulty in organizing their limited supply of knowledge around strictly defined skills which must be acquired. For the rest, relaxation has produced anti-intellectualism rather than new organization of knowledge. The apparently confident divisions and sub-divisions of the new diploma curriculum in fact represent the vitiation of intellectual activity, the fragmentation and trivialization of learning about the social world.

The re-organization of the curriculum has been matched by a revision of content; there has been a wave of "relevance", which in the event has often meant (a) locating subject matter ever closer to the present and (b) adopting the focus and categories of the press and media ("problems" "issues" etc). Again the direction and meaning of these changes is questionable - they seem to represent a loss of confidence in "old" subject matter rather than the emergence of a bold, confident new understanding.

And, there have been all sorts of moves to "give" the curriculum a new relationship with "practice". We think that here too we are witnessing streamlining, not the emergence of a new paradigm. The curriculum - practice juxtaposition has been altered - the student's encounters with them are closer in time; the curriculum talks a lot more about "practice"; the managers of the curriculum and the managers of "practice" talk more to each other; students are briefed and de-briefed. But the notion "praxis" - the making and conscious re-making of the self and its social relations - remains foreign to formal schooling.

A last crunch for the "new" curriculum is its measurement. Again changes seem legion - exams are out, continuous assessment is in; essays are under fire; now we have pre-structured multiple choice tests and skills tests (from the Technicians) and projects, enquiries even conversations (from the PLH). But none of them disrupt the existing power of teachers over students, and through them of dominant institutions over social practice. Again the impulse seems to have ranged from a desire to obscure and mitigate direction and overt control, to a loss of confidence in the old ways of testing. Again the result is not a brave start on a confident voyage, but a shrug of shoulders, a tacit admission that there's not much more we can do, is there?

It is in the realms of knowledge that we see both the attempt of the teacher college to make difficult adjustments in the internal dialectic education, and of education's relationship with its masters. But discovering and implementing new forms of knowledge to fit out the new teacher of the new knowledge worker is a tricky business. There seems to be no clear way of selecting content, organizing it, testing it; of reconciling these functions with the new pedagogy; and finally, of tackling that hoary old chestnut, the problem of theory and practice. Technicians are feeling easier about these things than their colleagues, but only because they have the advantage of not noticing the problems, and/or of mindless faith in the powers of their procedures. We should not be surprised to see Graeme Speedy in his responses to the IGPP, seeing these as major problems, and, implicitly seeing their solution as the decisive test for the new guard. Indeed it is; if the teachers college is to perform its function as the key interpreter of new styles of conduct, and new styles of knowledge, he'll have to win. Our guess is that like the new "personalized" style of the modern lecturer, and like the "team" manager, the new knowledge will perhaps reduce irritation, but will leave untouched irresponsibility, anomic carelessness.

F. <u>So What do Those Stereotypes Really Do?</u>

Near the start of this paper we made the point that the finest educational policy will be worthless if it is not built upon a sound understanding of the various ways in which society moves and is moving. An educational philosophy may be full of fine words but if existing social structures and processes will render it ineffective then it is in that light that it must be judged.

.../22.

Later we accused each of the stereotype educationists of sharing an inadequate social science and thus implied that their intentions would not be matched by their effects.

We have now sketched in the social circumstances as we see them, and so are in a position to determine the actual, as distinct to the intended, effects of our three stereotype educators.

(I) The technician

The new evolving structure will have an important role for the "Technician", although he will find it increasingly difficult to rise far beyond the shop floor himself (except insofar as he is able to add new broader management skills, thus changing his character.)

His task basically is to reproduce himself systematically and efficiently, thus ensuring the flow of skills required by the emerging productive apparatus. His is not a policy-making role, but the changing nature of specialisms will provide the illusion of significant choice in the way he carries out his function. The imperatives of his situation (academic, professional, etc.) will probably lead him to map his allotted territory in ever increasing detail and to trick it out with the trappings of intellectual sophistication. He will make his special area of competence absorbing for himself and impenetrable to anyone operating without his guidance. This helps to emphasize his indispensability and insulate himself against criticism from anyone who has not mastered the constantly increasing quantities of empirical data, jargon and trivial conceptual debate generated and marshalled by the specialist and his co-workers. He will also take the usual steps to make his subject compulsory, to multiply course offerings and to monopolise assessment and accreditation. In all these ways he is helping to make the practical world less accessible, less manageable and more mysterious for the common man and the would-be practitioner alike. Thus the technician is not only ensuring the flow of skilled detail-workers (the new technical intelligentsia), but also cementing the cultural foundations for the new technocracy.

(II) The PLH

The intellectual beautification of specialisms is taking place at the same time as the constriction and impoverishment of the PLH's sphere. The 'man of general culture' is under pressure from many quarters. His traditional role of formulating and propounding general explanations of and inspirational accounts of his and fellows' shared circumstances is being whittled away. Such general questions as purpose, of whys and wherefores, seem to have been displaced by questions which have factual answers, which require knowledge of the appropriate empirical data or the relevant committee decisions; and for answers to these we will ask an expert. Thus it will soon be as difficult to obtain a hand-crafted, locally produced account of where your institution/community is headed and why, as it is to obtain good home-made pickles - and for exactly the same reasons.

Also, if we are right about the two systems of education (the sharper separation of general socialization and technical training), then the liberal humanist in the tertiary sector is going to find that what he has been pleased to call his 'academic freedom' is being whittled away. This is happening now, almost imperceptibly, through the increasingly closer specification and/or supervision of task and

method. This form of encroaching control - impersonal, bland, and so, so reasonable, necessitated by the demands of distant funding and accrediting bodies for productive efficiency - is very hard to recognise, let alone resist.

At present the liberal's effect, as distinct from his intentions, is to mute and confuse potential opponents of the system. By setting himself to soften some of the more idiotic and irritating aspects of the system, the liberal, (whether he succeeds or not), gives the system a more human face. By projecting his own personal warmth and sympathy to those who suffer under the system as it is, the PLH blurs the basic structural determinants of the situation without being able to alter them. If a relaxed manner, persuasively argued principles, warm personal relationships and decent conduct could undo the damage caused by the system then the PLH would have triumphed long ago. All these (fine) qualities can do is to make a basically hierarchical and destructive system seem a little softer at the point of contact. To adopt an informal manner towards one's students, to substitute assignments for exams, to let them refine their essay topics, to sympathise when they blow up emotionally - none of this alters the relative positions of teacher and student in any fundamental way. To push open learning, to relax discipline, to humanize the classroom situation - none of this will make a jot of difference if the structural determinants of the system's path are forcing it in another direction. What the PLH teaches is how to lose graciously; elegant resignation in the public sphere offset, in his own eyes, by the jealous safeguarding of decent principles in a restricted private domain. But the structural forces of late capitalism, described in the previous section, operate beyond the reach of private principles and psycho-therapy.

The New Manager

The New Manager is without a doubt the most important of our three figures. He is the man upon whom the whole process of modernisation and co-ordination depends.

Just as the PLH helps to absorb and deflect the system's contradictions at the face-to-face level, so the manager performs the same task at the level of inter-group relations. When we hear the manager complain about being "the meat in the sandwich", about being "shot at from all sides", about having to reconcile the unreconcilable, then we are hearing how it feels to be inside this role.

This pivotal position will feel uncomfortable to the individual in it - it is the manager's problem, it is where he is; but the only alternative would be the growth of overt politics as different groups encountered one another's claims and ambitions at first hand. This would increase the possibility of the system's basic structures and norms being called into question, with a consequent increase in the likelihood of a radical change in the location of power.

A closely related consequence of the New Manager's work is the centralisation of information, techniques and resources in his hands. He is in a singularly powerful position to define problems, to delimit the range of answers, and to influence outcomes without seeming to do so. His monopoly of information, techniques and resources is a more important buttress of his position than his legal entitlement to authority, given that it is not fashionable to pull rank too often or too hard.

Given the long period of neglect of education in Australia, it is not difficult to see why the New Manager believes he is near the cutting edge of innovation in a particularly exciting period. In fact he is dancing a path which has been mapped out for him by the top-most echelons of our new planning elite, a path dictated not by educational considerations per se, but rather by the need to produce a labour force with the desired skills and dispositions. Thus it is no accident that he increasingly resembles the manager of a mining complex or advertising agency; they are all three ensuring the regular and adequate supply, and the continuous improvement, of an essential economic component - be it skilled labour, raw materials or markets.

Let us conclude our account of the New Manager and his role. We may say that the advent of the Federal Labour Government heralded the era of comprehensive social management. Nowhere is this motif more apparent than in the sphere of education. If we can remove ourselves a little from his day-to-day projects and personal ambitions, we can see that the newly-created Education Manager is the agent of this general socio-political strategy. The distant architects of corporate capitalism have allocated our man the role of Branch Manager, responsible for supervising the construction work in his locality. Our New Manager is doing splendidly.

There are one/two further remarks which may be applied to our trio as a whole. We have argued that their stated objectives can only be understood if set in the social context where they are to be pursued; and that educators either fail to do that, or misunderstand the context. We have argued that our educators' hopes and stated objectives will usually be widely at variance with their effects, or a very incomplete anticipation of them.

We would add, if it were necessary, that the worst outcomes of the system we've been attacking are not intended by our educators. We might adapt a passage from the English writer Robin Blackburn and ask:

> How many educators resolutely decide that they must keep students in their place, keep their eyes closed to difficult possibilities which are not recognised or well-regarded by the system; how many resolutely decide to make learning into a farce performed cynically for extrinsic re-wards; how many will decide to inculcate narrow political prejudices and habits of subordination, or to package their students to meet commercial specifications? Do any at all? On the contrary, how many mightn't even feel a stealthy susurrus of dismay if they learnt that this was the end outcome of their harmless, familiar routines?... What finally defines the whole system is that it utterly expunges men from the place of its essential working. These decisions are not taken in the board room or the bank manager's suite or even the exclusive club or the pleasure yacht. They are taken <u>nowhere</u>. They are <u>not taken</u>, they are not decisions: fatalities. Nobody calculates them and enacts them, they happen unmeant. Our callous and malformed priorities are the prodigious obverse of a thousand discrete, blameless gestures. (35)

A thousand, discrete blameless gestures they may be; but there is a pattern if you look. The pattern is as we have described earlier. Those who will not think at the level of overall patterns cannot

understand the full character of their day-to-day activity. But seen or not seen, the pattern is there and the day-to-day work of our three educators is indispensible for its unfolding and entrenchment. Our educators are capitalist educators. Nothing more, nothing less.

Can we offer an alternative? Is there any way that people who see the world as we have described it, who maintain that educational institutions are hooked deeply into the productive system, can conscientiously and effectively work within those institutions? We have no clear answer to that question; the answer is, for us, slowly being written now, as it is written whenever we act politically. Our present, (though tentative) conclusion is that we can. We can do it at three levels; firstly, at the level of our teaching practice; secondly in programs for institutional change; and thirdly, as socialists taking part in the broad struggle for socialism.

We think that the IGPP was correctly aimed at three important elements of our teaching lives - at the social relations of the production of knowledge; at the content and organization of knowledge; and at the relationship between theory and practice. We will deal very briefly with these, since they have already been dealt with in the IGPP papers.

The social relations of the production of knowledge:

Knowledge which is imposed, which is not generated by its possessor, or is not acquired with his active and freely-chosen participation, is an oppression. It oppresses because the imposition of meaning, the provision of a construction of reality, is a way of robbing people of independence and dignity. Meanings can only be imposed where one person must submit to the will of another. Schools are just such institutions; so are teachers colleges. The acquisition and display of the codes, the language, the world view, of people in power is the condition of "success" - i.e. of acquiring the things people in power can hand out - jobs, status, pay, security. And because the people in power have these goods in store, they come to acquire others - teachers, for example, can assuage the student's self-doubt, increase his self-esteem, disparage or wound him, make him insecure; they (we should not talk about third parties - it is all of us here who make up 'they') - we can even persuade our students, the people who must please us - to take on our masks, to become our running dogs. Watch that student who puts down his fellows with a display of flash knowledge, or academic vocabulary. Not far from view is the approval which he wants, and the tutor holds.

There is another reason to demand the end of teacher-power. While people desire teacher's rewards, they must compete. They become alone, more or less fearful. The knowledge they generate is private knowledge; they regard it as private property. They learn to get knowledge which achieves individual ends. They do not take account of social need; they have no experience in recognizing it, and combining with others to meet it. They are bourgeois individuals, not socialists. The first step to the co-operative production of socially-needed knowledge is the removal relationships of power. Lecturer power means student impotence. Impotence is the essence of the state of being a "student". Students will only disappear when "lecturers" disappear.

Any system of teacher education which wants to produce people who know what they think about the world, who know how to act in it, to be in possession of themselves, must destroy the power which the teacher has over the student. The first essential in this transformation is the separation of teaching from assessment. Our concrete proposals would largely parallel those of the IGPP.

The IGPP also suggests what might come in the places of the "lecturers" and the "students" - people who meet often, ask and give help, undertake work in the interests of all, hold themselves open to help, suggestion and criticism, to socialist reason. People who constantly try to get better and finding out what needs to be done and at doing it. Every year the total labour power of seven hundred students disappears into folders, or waste-paper baskets. It does so, at bottom, because there are seven hundred individuals competing with each other to please fifty individuals. That will go on until the seven hundred and fifty combine, in equality, to produce.

The content and organization of knowledge.

It follows that knowledge formed and organized by others must, at the very least, be re-formed and re-organized by active learning; the discipline, the course, the subject, will disappear for most people for most of the time. The new knowledge will be new because it will be fashioned and re-fashioned to meet the ever-changing tasks of people in their special and collective work. In this they will depend heavily on the respectful help of others; often the help will be more given than received, especially by people who are older, and more experienced. In our job, the basic task is easy to see - to help make teachers who will be able, like their teachers, to teach without power.

We believe that an essential part of such learning is to achieve an increasingly accurate apprehension of the social forces represented by the teacher, and of the ways in which this can become the subject of conscious control. It must acknowledge which shows the public origins of private sociology to phenomenology. This paper is a representation of the current state of our attempt to do that learning.

The knowledge which is sought must always be tested against against its ability to help the less powerful against the more powerful. In our situation, can it help student to recover powers seized by staff? staff to appropriate power held by administration? and administration to resist attacks on its independence by administrations beyond it? But the crucial characteristic of a socialist knowledge brings us to our third category:

Theory and practice

Teachers, like all other political workers, act in ways which have and are intended to have, an impact on others; the thing to learn, as we began by saying, is how to be more conscious and more moral in doing it. In other words, to decrease the gap between what you think you're doing or wanting to do, and what you do. Teachers must learn, then, to explain to themselves, and amongst themselves, what they're doing. We have talked with a young teacher who was repulsed by 'sin bins' (solitary confinement for kids who won't conform to teacher's wishes), but couldn't say why. Because he couldn't say why, he couldn't resist their use in his school. We've also talked with teachers who are very good at saying why education is a capitalist plot, but not at working out what they ought to do about it. Each represents the gap between theory and practice. Less obviously, but just as surely, so do institutions called teacher's colleges which are separate from institutions called schools; and the existence of people called lecturers who are paid twice as much as people called teachers; and subjects called methodology and experiences called practice teaching.

To learn to understand what you're doing, and to change what you're doing as a result of understanding, is a complex business. It can only be learned by mutual help and criticism, which means that you have to be one of a group whose members know each other well, who have time to think and talk which is not too far from where they do (a few weeks away at most, for beginners); and the group must include people who know your practice, and that of others; and people who are good at teasing out the character/effects of action. It would never occur to such a group to separate any of these functions by status, or time, or the formation of separate 'institutions'. The IGPP learning group is an example of what we have in mind. And as it suggests, the idea of a group consisting of 700 is a bit bizarre. Fifteen is more like it.

Struggle at the second level

People who hold power over things like the learning of others are reluctant to give that power up, or to see it exercised in ways they don't approve of. So they usually use their power to see that it doesn't happen - there are exceptions, (people who have given up power because they thought they should, or because they were tired), but mostly power isn't so much given up as taken. So in the absence of a change of heart of the men who do the managing of education, those who are managed will have to put up a fight. That's one of the lessons of the IGPP.

The focus of the fight must always be control of the production knowledge; it must always tend to increase the power of the producers, and decrease that of the helper or suppliers.

In most such fights the people who run things have got two advantages - they're unified, and they know what's what; by contrast, the controlled are usually divided, and are often confused or apathetic. It follows that we need to unite, and to advance understanding of how things work.

In concrete terms we should help to make a militant teachers union to wrest control from management; and encourage the formation of student unions and organizations to insist that teachers don't try to have their cake and eat it too. But these groups must not merely be militant,

.../27/

but must increasingly understand that the real issue is not good wages, or good working conditions,. They are of course essential, a right not a privilege, and must be protected. But they are a pre-requisite. The real issue in our lives is control of the work we do. Builders labourers have raised their sights from wages to conservation; we must try to accomplish the same sort of feat.

We can do so in two ways: firstly, by pressing for educational changes that matter. Our rule of thumb is that a change is worth fighting for if it makes a contribution to the kind of transformation we have suggested, changes in teacher-student relations; or the content and organization (especially the organization) of knowledge; or the relationship between theory and practice; it's worth fighting for, in short, if it's a revolutionary reform. Pressing for this kind of change raises consciousness, - i.e. it increases understanding of how things work and who rules the roost; fights like that smoke the heavies out of their lairs, and invisibility is one of their main defences. The squatters in Victoria Street showed that land prices are acts not of god or inflation or modern times, but of capitalism in the form of rich and their thugs and police.

The second way of increasing understanding, of dispelling the mists which linger around the higher levels of the hierarchy, is by hard research and appropriate propaganda. There's plenty to do. What are the connections between education and production? production and culture? education and social power? What mechanisms operate in the organization of education, of classrooms, schools? How is educational knowledge made, and distributed, and who decides? How do people feel in schools? How do they treat each other, and perceive themselves? Increasingly accurate analysis and reporting of these is essential understanding to any movement which wants work in education in ways which will help to transform the wider society. Sometimes the work will be less ambitious, but just as necessary. Who took that decision? Why did they promote X instead of Y? What proportion of the budget went on ancillary staff this year compared with last? Who's using this textbook?

The results of this work can't be left to lie about in the usual coffins; they must be made available in a form and a forum which will reach the people who can use the knowledge - its probably no accident that articles for learned journals are OK for your curriculum vitae, but articles for Trib, or the student newspaper, or the teacher's paper aren't. Socialists must remain independent of that kind of repressive thinking. Perhaps we can summarize our thinking about action at the level of education systems this way: One of the striking things about official reports on education, and especially the two reports of the ACAE referred to in this paper, is the bland assumption that the Commission will ordain, and the 'system' (i.e. people) will faithfully obey. The education system (us) will be a mere embodiment of their plans, their will: there is no suspicion that we, the people who teach and learn, have any independent will at all - by their tone of voice they might well be a firm of transport consultants predicting changes in traffic flow after installation of new lights. The task is to prove them wrong. Solidarity and awareness are the only weapons. And any program which attempts that through individuals only, or in organizational modification only, or within institutions only, or by "staff development" only, or by grace of the powers-that-be only, or indeed by any combination of these only is bound to be conservative reform.

Struggle at the third level

Above all, just as our analysis of capitalist society is one which construes all social events as belonging, in complex and often hidden ways, to a 'system', a 'whole', then so must our program for its transformation have a whole, a unifying, character. Socialists working in education will need to feel a firm sense of fraternity not only with others working in education, but with all socialists. And because the ultimate key to change is in the hands of the working class, we must associate ourselves particularly with them.

This association is barely visible; it is our guess that it will be made much stronger and more visible by shifts in the character of production referred to earlier. Education institutions are increasingly engaged not in the production and confirmation of an elite (though small parts of the tertiary sector go on doing that) but in the production of an intellectually trained proletariat. What is more, as we have suggested, this production of a proletariat is increasingly carried on in institutions whose relations of production, whose organization, is like that of other institutions of production - (the factory) and the big institutions of administration - (the office). The jokes about intellectual sausage machines go near the knuckle. Each of these developments will bring the circumstance and the experience of those in tertiary education closer and closer to that of the "traditional" proletariat. Yet unlike the worker who is not intellectually trained, the new worker is restive because there is a gap between the ideology and aspirations which intellectual training bring, and the actual circumstances of his work. And his absolute and relative numbers are growing rapidly. Drucker doesn't like the look of things at all. Who would have thought, ten years ago, that bank officers, ACSPA, and teachers would be going out on strike? It is important that we become part of this movement. As intellectually trained workers our particular contribution will be in the production and distribution of the knowledge that's needed. Much of this will be aimed at assisting in the recovery of worker's intellectual and expressive culture - already there are signs of this happening - the factory-gate theatre, the appearance of radical research and critiques in union papers, the combination of workers and intellectuals in anti-imperialism, conservation, and housing struggles. In the same way, only work in a worker's movement will save intellectuals from the character and consequences of life in capitalist educational institutions. A socialist working in the mass movements must be a friend of the people, an indefatigable teacher, not a bureaucratic politician.

DA:nb/bf
15.3.74

1. Norman Birnbaum The Crisis of Industrial Society (London 1969) pp 110-111.

2. John Horton "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies" American Journal of Sociology LXXI (May 1966) pp 701-13. Reprinted in James E. Curtis and John W. Peters The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader (London 1970) pp 605-624.

3. Norman Birnbaum "The Crisis in Marxist Sociology" Social Research, Vol.35. No.2. (Summer 1968) quoted in John Playford Neo-Capitalism in Australia (Melbourne 1969) p. 6.

4. John H. Schaar and Sheldon S. Wolin "Education and Technological Society" New York Review of Books (October 9, 1969) pp 3-6; this quotation p.4.

5. Peter F. Drucker The Age of Discontinuity (London 1969) p.77.

6. Ibid p.77

7. Ibid p.350

8. Ibid p.26

9. Ibid p.59

10. Ibid p.407

11. Ibid pp 190-191

12. Australian Commission on Advanced Education Third Report, 1973-1975 (Canberra 1972) p.4.

13. Ibid p.45

14. Doug White "Education and Capitalism", in John Playford and Douglas Kirsuer (eds) Australian Capitalism (Melbourne 1972) pp 219-247, this quotation p.220.

15. Birnbuam The Crisis of Industrial Society op.cit. p. 121.

16. Drucker op.cit. p.389.

17. Ibid p.420

18. Ibid p.394

19. Ibid p.389

20. Michael B. Katz Class, Bureaucracy and Schools (New York 1971) quoted on p.31.

21. Ibid. p.32.

22. Australian Commission on Advanced Education Teacher Education 1973-1975 (Canberra 1973) p.3.

23. Ibid. p.92

24. Ibid. p.58

25. Ibid. p.108

26. Ibid. p.56

Contd/...

27. Ibid. p.103

28. Ibid. p.22

29. Ibid. p.20

30. ACAE Report op.cit. p.89

31. Ibid. p.53

32. "Integrated, Group-structured Pre-professional Program"- a final-year program which was proposed by a small group of staff and students at Sturt C.A.E. in 1973. The proposal was the subject of long, arduous and revealing debate in the Academic Committee of SCAE; the reference here is to the fact that opposition to the scheme was led by the college administration, and that in the final vote (tied 8-8, and therefore lost) no less than five of the right negative votes were cast by full-time administrators. By the time the final votes had been cast it had become crystal clear that the battles still remaining (with the Education Department, the Teachers Registration Board, the Board of Advanced Education) would make the Academic Committee tussle look like a tea-party.

33. ACAE. Teacher Education op.cit. p.11.

34. Ibid. pp 8-9

35. ACAE. Report op.cit. p.

36. Perry Anderson, in Towards Socialism p.118.